

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2003

				110
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,903	10/15/2001	Jason Lee Crouse	18617-0001	9491
29052 7	590 06/17/2003			
SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP			EXAMINER	
999 PEACHTF ATLANTA, G	REE STREET, N.E. A 30309		WONG, ST	EVEN B
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3711	14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

_			B		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/890,903	CROUSE, JASON	LEE		
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Steven Wong	3711			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a simal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	han SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three m earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nsion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	pecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or	simplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s):				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		separate, timely file	d amendment		
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: S		sidered but does No	OT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		to issues which we	ere newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims we	nt(s) a)□ will not be entered or t would be rejected is provided bel	o)∏ will be entered low or appended.	and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	S :				
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed oni	is a)□ approved or b)□ disap	proved by the Exar	miner.		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

10. Other: ____

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

Continuation Sh et (PTO-303) 09/890,903

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applicant's remarks and calculations provided therewith are not persuasive. While the present invention may eliminate flair, the instant claims fail to preclude the bristles from flairing as taught by Kolodney et al. The claims merely define bristles in a vertical orientation which is clearly taught by both Fariest and Kolodney et al. Regarding the calcuations of Professor Ridley, while the the calculations may show a particularly desirable range for the bristles, this is far short of defining any criticality. Attention is again directed to In re Aller where it is well setted that the result must be different in kind and not merely in degree. Here, the results of Prof. Ridley merely show a desirable diameter which is only different in degree from the results of other diameters. These results are not different in kind and therefore fail the test for criticality.